

"The era of procrastination, of half-measures, of soothing and baffling expedients, of delays, is coming to its close. In its place we are entering a period of consequences."

He was predicting that World War II was going to start, and this was as far back as 1936.

He went on to say later on:

"People say we ought not to allow ourselves to be drawn into a theoretical antagonism between Nazism and democracy; but the antagonism is here now. It is this very conflict of spiritual and moral ideas"—that's what we're facing right now, spiritual and moral ideas of the radicals—"which gives the free countries a great part of their strength."

Winston Churchill, who was vilified, was absolutely correct. They should have prepared for war. They should have let Herr Hitler know that there was going to be no giving of any quarter to him, and it might have prevented World War II and maybe saved 40, 50, 60 million lives.

Winston Churchill went on to say after the war was about to begin in the House of Commons in 1938:

"Britain and France had to choose between war and dishonor. They chose dishonor, and now they will have war." And they did have war.

Churchill also said:

"And do not suppose that this is the end. This is only the beginning of the reckoning."

I hope our government realizes that this is not the end of the war with the terrorists. This is still going on. Although bin Laden has been killed, there's still a lot of terrorists out there that believe we're weak and that we're not going to follow through and that they can prevail in the long run. We need to send a message like Churchill did prior to what Lord Chamberlain did by going to Munich that we're going to be tough and we're going to follow through. I think the President needs to send that message very loud and clear, instead of reaching out, now that bin Laden is gone, and saying to the terrorist world, "Now that bin Laden's gone, your leader's gone, we ought to sit down and work this thing out." That is a sign of weakness. And I hope the President when he makes this speech makes absolutely clear to the terrorists that we're willing to do whatever it takes to protect America and the free world.

As Churchill went on to say, "This is only the beginning of the reckoning. This is only the first sip, the first foretaste of a bitter cup which will be proffered to us year by year unless by a supreme recovery of moral health and martial vigor, we arise again and take our stand for freedom as in the olden time." That was in October of 1938.

We're in a war against terrorism. It's something that hasn't been seen since the 12th century when the radical Islamists tried to take over western Europe. A lot of people don't remember that. But they did. And there's always

those radicals who want to foist upon the rest of the world their religious beliefs and the way they think the world should be run. We have to when they rise up again and again and again as they will throughout history, I'm sure that there will always be radical Islamists who will want to make sure the rest of the world believes the way they do as far as their religious beliefs are concerned. Whether it's now, or whether it was in the 12th century, or whether it's going to be in the future, the free world has to be resolute of purpose and make absolutely sure that the message is sent loud and clear that we are willing to do whatever it takes to defeat the terrorists. That means doing whatever it takes to get information from their leaders to make sure that we find the terrorists in whatever hole they've dug themselves in to protect themselves.

I'm very happy we got Osama bin Laden. I think it's a great step forward in the quest for peace. But the war is not over. It's going to go on for some time, until the terrorists know that there's no possibility of winning, and the threat to our homeland from terrorism, the threat to the free world from terrorism, goes on.

I would like to end, if I could, to say to the President—I know I can't talk to him because he's not here—but if I were talking to the President, I would say: Mr. President, when you make this speech, allegedly to reach out to the Arab world, make it absolutely clear that we're going to do whatever it takes to defeat the terrorists as long as it takes.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1140

#### TROUBLES ON THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I want to identify with the comments of my friend from Indiana. Well said. Great thoughts.

We have wonderful friends in this world, as a Nation. But we need to recognize who are our friends and who are our enemies and who are the places, the countries, the peoples that intend us harm, who are the people that are willing to assist us in encouraging and allowing for freedom to spread around the world.

We should be well aware that there are people across our border in Mexico who are not Mexicans, people who would like to see this Nation fail as such an important keeper of the peace.

We know that Hezbollah has been setting up camp across the U.S. border in Mexico; that they have been working with drug cartels in Mexico, and it appears we see some of the signs of

that in the ways that people are murdered, the way the crime business has developed.

We know that people coming across our border into this country, a significant percentage at least, are other than Mexican. OTM, they're classified. So many of them from the Middle East, many who are taught to try to appear as Hispanic and come across and try to avoid indicating anything that would give away the fact that they are coming here, not for jobs, but to set up to try to do us harm.

So when you are aware that there is so much violence on the border, Americans being murdered down on both sides of the border, we have two lakes between Texas and Mexico, Lake Falcon and Lake Amistad, together about 85 miles of international border that should be patrolled by the United States Coast Guard. But this administration doesn't wish to see the Coast Guard there.

Visiting with the Texas Governor a few weeks ago, he had made clear, please help me in urging the administration to allocate some Coast Guard resources to these lakes, where the drug cartels are bringing dangerous people, bringing drugs, bringing mayhem across into the U.S. Texas is committing money, resources, manpower on the lake, but it's a Federal job.

And what we've seen with this administration, when a State does too good a job or tries too well to do the job the Federal Government is not doing in order to protect its State, this administration decides to sue them.

We've seen also recently that if there is plenty of evidence to support that people or groups are funding terrorism in the world, and it is radical Islamists that are doing that, then this administration wants to embrace the groups that we have evidence are funding terrorism, rather than confront them and stop them. It's an interesting time we live in.

I do want to follow up on the President's comments. Here Texas has suffered the loss of around 2.3 million acres burned in the last decade or so. Other Presidents, other administrations, and even this administration, have recognized that when 177,000 acres, 300, 400, 500,000 acres have been destroyed, that is certainly worthy of declaring a disaster area in order to provide Federal support.

Texas is a donor State. We always put much more into the Federal Government from Texas than Texas ever gets back. We're proud to be such an important, vital part of the United States.

It does follow that when there is such a compelling disaster as the wildfires in Texas, 2.3 million acres destroyed, that it would be nice to have the support of the President. But just as this administration snubbed all the contributions that Houston provided to the shuttle program, and refused to allow a shuttle to be on display permanently in the NASA Space Center in

Houston, also Texas was again snubbed there with the 2.3 million acres being burned, snubbed without any assistance or declaration of a Federal disaster area.

Then we know the President did have a rather nice fundraiser in Austin, during which probably hundreds of thousands of dollars were sucked out of Texas due to the President's fundraising, and then headed to El Paso.

And I have to say, much of the President's speech in El Paso was very good. It was unifying, coming from a man who said he was a uniter, not a divider.

But then, toward the end of the speech, the gloves came off and things were said that were not true. The President said, and I know they weren't lies because a lie requires intent to deceive on the part of the speaker, and I'm sure the President would not ever want to do that, but he did state things that were not true and they need to be addressed.

The President said the fence is basically finished, that the fence on our border is basically finished. Actually, our border is nearly 2,000 miles, around 1,969 miles of border between the United States and Mexico. Close to two-thirds of that are in Texas.

We know that the so-called "fence" was going to be largely consisting of a virtual fence, where there's no real fence, but there's technology utilized that would allow monitoring, checking to ensure that the border was protected even without a physical fence there. So not only was there no physical fence, the administration ended that program. No virtual fence, no physical fence. We're open for business for the drug trade. Despite the Border Patrol, the limited folks, they're doing all they can, it is such a massive border, it requires more help than is currently there.

We withstood belittling from the President as he stood in El Paso, Texas, where just within a few miles, 3,000 people have been killed in the last year just across our border, the violence spilling over into the United States.

□ 1150

And the President chose this time and location to belittle those who say we should secure our border; we should comply with our oath. We have an obligation to provide for the common defense. That includes securing our borders. And the President wants to belittle those of us who say let's keep our oath. Let's keep faith with the American people by defending them, by defending our sovereignty.

This administration, on the other hand, the very administration that makes light of those who say let's secure our border; let's protect our people, instead of doing that, says: You know what, Arizona, with 30 miles or so of border with Mexico and wilderness area where we don't allow any mechanized vehicle to go, I tell you what: We'll put up a sign, which they

did, and there's a lot of violent drug smuggling, dangerous people coming in this area, so we would advise American citizens to use the areas north of the interstate, because this administration has basically turned over our sovereign soil to foreign, illegal, violent drug smugglers. That should not allow for any smug condescension and belittling of those who are concerned about our security.

We were told in the President's speech that, since 2004, the President has more than doubled the Border Patrol. The actual fact is that, when President Bush took office, there were about 8,600 Border Patrol, around that number. When Bush left office, there were about 17,500 Border Patrol. And it took us a while to convince President Bush to do it, but President Bush did double the number of Border Patrol on our southern border. And since President Obama has taken office in the last 2½ years, that has increased 18 percent.

But if you want to know what the President personally feels about what should be done, you can look at his 2011 budget that he proposed, because he actually cuts the number of Border Patrol.

Yes, it is true: Bush doubled the number of Border Patrol. But the truth is, this administration has increased it only a fraction of that and shown its true intent. They would just as soon cut it. Well, this Congress isn't going to let that happen.

The President said, We've got more people on the border than we have ever had in history. That is simply not true. I realize that the President has spoken previously of what he says are the 57 States in our country, so perhaps he is not aware of the history that goes back to 1916 when a man named Pancho Villa from Mexico was involved in a handful of Americans being killed. President Wilson was not going to allow that to build. He wasn't going to allow renegades from Mexico to come illegally into this country and kill Americans. So he took a stand, he sent General Pershing there, and with 10,000 to 20,000 troops, Pershing went into Mexico chasing after Pancho Villa.

The way it was done may not have been well thought out; but the fact is that at one point during that time, in order to protect America from the small number of murders that had occurred from illegal Mexicans coming into the United States around 1916, Wilson had over 100,000 troops, early National Guard folks, down on the border to protect our sovereignty.

So obviously the President was not aware that any President had ever seen murders by illegal immigrants coming into our southern area as important as President Woodrow Wilson did, but hopefully someone on his staff can do the research that hadn't been done before in the White House and advise the President: Hey, there was a President who took it real seriously when Americans were killed along our border. He didn't go to El Paso and make a speech

making fun of those who were concerned about our security. He actually sent over 100,000 troops, and they stopped the insanity before it could go any further.

Some historians talk about how Pershing was not able to get Pancho Villa and how much it cost. There was a lot of waste in that campaign, perhaps a lot more were committed than necessary, except he made his point: the violence stopped.

And when our enemies who would like to destroy our way of life here take away all the goodness that is developed in this country, take away the things that people, we are told maybe as many as 1.5 billion of the 6 billion people in the world would like to come to America at some time or other, there's got to be something good going on when that many people would like to come here.

But there are those who want to destroy that, take it away, and this President has an obligation and an oath to protect it. We hope that he will stop the belittling of those who want him to keep the oath and live up to his true commitments.

But we are dealing with a President who said: If you like your insurance, you can keep it. And we find out that wasn't true. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. We found out that wasn't true.

We were told here recently by the President in another speech just in the last week or so that we are producing more oil right now than at any time in our history. I know he doesn't know or he wouldn't have said that, but the fact is that we have produced as many as 9.6 million barrels of oil, and right now we are producing 5.5 million barrels of oil in this country.

We also know that this is a President who assured us that he would go line by line and scrub that budget, and that has never happened. He told us that Vice President BIDEN was not going to allow any fraud or waste. We know that hasn't happened. He said that he was going to close Guantanamo within the year. I'm very grateful that he didn't keep his word on that.

He said he was a uniter, not a divider, that he would bring people together, and I hope and pray that, at some point before his 4 years are up, he will actually do that.

But there are people that want to destroy this country. We can no longer play around, make fun of each other in this country while people are set about to destroy us. We've got to defend what we've got.

We had a hearing in Judiciary where the Attorney General of the United States testified, and we also know that there is a memo. He has been given the date and who provided the memo, and we asked for a copy of it. He hasn't been willing to provide that either to PETE KING or to Judiciary thus far, so we are probably going to have to subpoena it if he doesn't; and we may come to quite a row, governmentally speaking, if they will not provide it.

Instead, the Attorney General said, Oh, I understand there was an article in the Dallas News where the interim U.S. Attorney down there said that politics didn't play a role in our administration not pursuing the co-conspirators in the Holy Land Foundation terrorist funding trial.

□ 1200

We want the memo. We don't need a newspaper article from the Attorney General. And when we have documentation from the FBI that arose in the Holy Land Foundation trial, five defendants convicted of all 108 counts in late 2008, we know that in 2005 massive amounts of additional evidence were obtained, and we have these transactions, journal vouchers, there are deposit slips, all kinds of things, that helped establish with the judge that co-conspirators like ISNA or CAIR should be left as named co-conspirators and not eliminated from being named in the pleadings in the Holy Land Foundation trial, we know the evidence is there. We know that there is a case to be made. And yet this administration not only refuses to go after the Islamic Society of North America, often referred to as ISNA, but we have the remarks on the White House's own Web site, and this was put up March 6, 2011, remarks of Denis McDonough, Deputy National Security Adviser to the President. Our Deputy National Security Adviser starts his remarks at this Muslim Society by, "Thank you, Imam Magid, for your very kind introduction and welcome. I know that President Obama was very grateful that you led the prayer at last summer's Iftar dinner at the White House."

The president of a known co-conspirator of financing terrorism is not only buddies with our Deputy National Security Adviser, he's leading the Iftar prayer, which is the ceremony that ends the Ramadan celebration. So the White House had the Iftar celebration and had the president of the named co-conspirator in the Holy Land Foundation leading the prayer in the White House. Who's running this henhouse?

And then we find out, as we hear in the news, and I know the President gets briefed and is aware, not only are there al Qaeda involved in going after Qadhafi, we're helping those people, including al Qaeda. Qadhafi needs to go, but, my goodness, intelligent people on foreign affairs know you should never help take out a foreign leader unless you can be assured that the subsequent leader will be better for your country.

Whose country are we trying to help here anyway? We know we've got people being killed on our southern border, and instead, because the President said, not Congress, but the U.N. and Arab League had encouraged us to get involved in Libya, we're going to go expend American treasure and American lives at risk in Libya? That we're going to push for an ally, whether he's a nice guy or not, he was helping keep the peace in the Middle East, Mubarak, in

Egypt, and we pushed to take him out, so that instability is going to reign in the region.

Who's running this show? Who are we trying to help? We ought to be helping this country. That's where our oaths have been made and that's to whom the oaths have been made. It's scary stuff here. It is staggering what this administration is doing.

There's good information. Andy McCarthy and Patrick Poole have been publishing some good information on what has been going on in the Holy Land Foundation non-prosecution. It's time to defend this country, not be protecting other countries.

There have been some excellent things written and said encouraging the President on what would be appropriate action in the Middle East. Unfortunately, this administration has chosen to play handsy, be friendly with and encourage, it seems, the development of the relationship between Fatah, the Palestinian Authority leaders in the West Bank, with Hamas, who we have listed and know to be a terrorist organization that is in control of the Gaza Strip.

We have laws in this country that prohibit us from providing funds to any nation or any entity who is allied with terrorist organizations, and yet what we are seeing is this administration apparently being willing to somewhat embrace, I am hoping the President will come out and make clear he's not going this far, but embrace that, hey, the West Bank joining hands with Hamas, the terrorist organization, is okay, when the fact is our laws prohibit us providing money to Hamas.

We have had five defendants convicted in the Holy Land Foundation trial for providing funds, including to Hamas. And yet if this administration does not stop the funding of the Palestinian Authority when it is joined with Hamas, then whoever pushes for that funding may have some criminal sanctions to lie. This is a very, very serious issue and it needs to be addressed.

Caroline Glick, who writes for the Jerusalem Post, has an excellent article this week on that very issue, and I hope that, Madam Speaker, you and others will review that, because it makes very clear this administration keeps pushing the Israeli leaders to give away land, make unilateral concessions, when it is not Israel that is acting in terrorist fashion. This administration seems to be ignoring the fact that Hamas is still killing people in Israel, still killing people and promoting terrorism in the Middle East.

It is time to stop acting as if this Nation's administration is okay with terrorism in the Middle East as long as it is by the Muslim Brotherhood, as long as it is by Hamas or Hezbollah. We are helping rearm people who are Israel's enemies. This stuff's got to stop. It is insanity when we help arm people who want to see this Nation destroyed.

I hope and pray that this President will come to his senses, his advisers

will give him better advice, and that we can stop this. We are hurting ourselves when we hurt our friend Israel. It makes no sense. It has to stop.

We are going to be fortunate to have the leader of Israel speaking to us from that second-level podium right here on May 24, and I know the administration is going to be trying, probably has already, to push Binyamin Netanyahu into making concessions. But the fact is Israel is still under attack, its enemies are still not willing to recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish nation, they are still not willing to stop the pushing of hatred and the teaching of hatred and anti-Semitism in the Middle East. So Israel owes them no unilateral concessions. There should be nothing, and I hope and pray will be nothing in the way of concessions.

As I pointed out to Prime Minister Netanyahu, any time Israel in its long history going back 3,000 years or so has given up land to others, it is normally used as a staging area at some point from which to attack Israel.

The Tanakh is full of incidents where leaders of Israel have tried to placate terrorists, those who would want to destroy it; and giving them land, giving them things, paying tribute, it has never worked. It will never work. This is no time to do it now.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1418

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana) at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FLORES (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of medical reasons.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 50, 112th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, May 23, 2011, at 2 p.m.